

major energy importing regions in the world. Europe, Japan, China and the United States. Europe will be importing around an estimated 80 per cent of its daily needs of both oil and gas. The US rather less—but still more than 65 percent of its oil and around 30 per cent of its gas. By 2015 trade will likely account for almost 70 per cent of world oil demand—some 64 mb/d—and 20 per cent of world gas demand.

Is that trade secure? Can the US and others rely on trade rather than retreating to a policy of self sufficiency with all the costs which that could involve in terms of the environment and competitiveness?

I think the answer to that is also yes, but we can't take anything for granted. Genuine energy security needs sustained, long term engagement and action by both the industry and by Government. The issue of security arises not so much from the growing volume of consumption or the required trade growth but because the resources needed to supply the world's growing demand are concentrated in a relatively limited number of countries.

There are a number of sources of supply to the world market. Let me mention just three. The Caspian, through the Baku to Ceyhan pipeline which is now under construction, is scheduled to be producing and exporting 300,000 barrels per day by the end of 2005. Trinidad is now exporting some 200,000 barrels oil equivalent per day in the form of natural gas and the expansion plans which are now being carried through should double that figure by 2006. Indonesia is likely to be producing 1.5 million barrels per day oil equivalent and exporting 800,000 bdoe of that by the end of this decade. But however important these activities and those in other countries are, the inescapable fact is that even with all those areas developed successfully, the bulk of world traded supplies of both oil and gas for the future will almost certainly come from just three regions. The Middle East, Russia and Africa.

Going back to the estimates published by the IEA—which represent a fair consensus of informed opinion—of the 64 mbd of oil likely to be traded in 2015, well over 80 per cent will come from those three areas. For natural gas the figure is around 50 per cent.

That is the global picture. What about the US?

US energy demand is now 46 mbd of which two thirds is provided by oil and natural gas. The forecasts suggest that oil and gas demand will continue to grow so that by 2015 the US will be using around 21 mbd of oil, mainly in transportation and around 13 mbd of natural gas. In terms of resources the US remains strong. The US has more domestic supplies than any of the other major importing regions.

Alaska continues to produce just short of 1 million barrels per day and though oil production is declining, technology is progressively expanding the commercial life of Prudhoe Bay. The real strength for the future though lies in the Gulf of Mexico—in the deep water, which is producing 1.5 million barrels per day and which looks set to produce as much as 2.7 mb per day from 2010 onwards.

The gas position is also strong. As well as gas in the lower 48, and in the deep water of the Gulf of Mexico, there are extensive supplies—perhaps as much as 100tcf in Alaska which are ready to be brought to market once the infrastructure is in place. That's a strong position—but the US will still need imports and will still look to the world market to supply the balance of its needs through the next two decades. The forecasts suggest that the US will be importing some 13 mbd of oil and 3 mbd/day of natural gas in 2015.

What conclusions can we draw from all that? What do we need to do today to ensure that this country and its trading partners in Europe and Asia and elsewhere enjoy sustainable energy security?

The first conclusion is that these are single global markets. Oil, and increasingly gas are traded internationally. Every area will seek to develop its own resources rationally, but there is a competitive limit to that—set by the cost of development. The cost of self sufficiency for any area would be prohibitive. Trade and open markets have the sustained development of world economy over the last half century and I believe they can and will continue to do so. That applies to energy as much as to any other product. Energy prices will be set by the international market, and prices will affect the economy and the export markets of every country in the world. Energy security can't be achieved in one country. To deny the reality of the global economy would be dangerous and costly.

Secondly, the growth in trade worldwide means that everyone has an interest in the development of the widest possible range of available supplies to limit dependence on any single country. It would be dangerous, economically and strategically, to allow a situation to develop in which the US or any other region was dependent totally or very substantially on countries in the Middle East or any other single producer. At the moment the US imports some 11 mbd of oil. But those imports come from 57 different countries and no one country supplies more than 17 per cent. That is a good position to maintain. And to do so the US has to maintain the open flow of investment—to ensure that the international industry can invest with confidence in exploration and development across a diverse set of countries.

The best estimate of the total investment required to generate the flow of supplies necessary to match demand in 2015 is \$2,000 bn. That means that investment by the oil and gas industry will have to be even higher than the \$160 bn per annum which has been the average over the last few years. In financial terms I don't doubt that those resources can be found. But each individual investment by each company will be dependent on the climate for investment in the country concerned. That is why we are doing so much to support the principle of transparency—to ensure that the revenues we generate are used wisely in the interests of the long term development of the countries in which we invest. Corruption is an enemy of development, an enemy of business [because it raises costs], and an enemy of energy security.

The third conclusion is that we have to ensure that the necessary resources and infrastructure are built. That applies here to projects such as the Alaskan gas pipeline which could bring 1 million barrels per day oil equivalent to market, and to the development of LNG terminals which can open up channels of imported supply from Trinidad and West Africa. But the same point applies internationally—because infrastructure is necessary to bring resources to market from areas such as the Caspian and Siberia. In all these areas investment now will bring greater security for the future. I want to use this occasion to thank the US Government—under two administrations—for their sustained support for the development of the Baku Tbilisi Ceyhan pipeline. The line which will enhance energy security for the world as a whole could not have been built without that support.

Fourth, we have to continue to develop technology—pushing the edge of what can be done with the resources we have. Extracting more, and using them more efficiently. That ranges from the Deep water, where we and

others are now producing from fields in over 7,000 ft of water—two and a half times deeper than was possible ten years ago; to the progressive extension of recovery rates in Alaska; to the sort of work we have underway with our partners in the automobile sector to combine advances in lubricants, in fuels and in engine technology to lift the level of productivity in vehicles.

All those steps are necessary, and many if not most of them will start here in the US—because this is a world technological leader.

So to summarise:

We can't take energy security for granted, and we can't achieve it through protectionism. Demand is rising and the substitutes for oil and gas are a long way off. There is no physical shortage. Technological advances must be deployed both to increase the amount of energy which can be produced and to ensure that it is used with the maximum possible efficiency. Finally, and most importantly, the risks to energy security are political and cannot be resolved by the private sector alone. The private sector has a vital role to play—particularly international companies such as BP. We have to explore and invest in the development of diverse sources of supply and in the infrastructure to bring it to market. But as companies we work within a space defined by public policy decisions. Actions by Governments are crucial in keeping the market open to investment, and ensuring that trade continues to be free and open. Those actions will determine whether those of us in the private sector can make successful long term investments in the development of resources and infrastructure. Diversity of supply is crucial. If we want to avoid undue dependence on just one region such as the Middle East, we have to invest in technology and in trade—raising investment confidence to ensure that supplies and infrastructure are in place to bring oil and gas from areas such as Russia, West Africa and the Caspian. The challenge is to align the medium and long term perspective I have been describing with the inevitably shorter perspective of Government. That has always been the case but the need to achieve that alignment between the actions of the public and the private sector has never been more important than it is today. If we can achieve that alignment I believe we can ensure that secure supplies of energy continue to be available to consumers here in the US and internationally.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MAC COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 22, 2004

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for debate on rollcall vote 400, order of the previous question; rollcall vote 401, rule providing for consideration of Military Construction Appropriations (H. Res. 732); rollcall vote 402, recognizing the 35th anniversary of the *Apollo 11* lunar landing (H. Res. 723); rollcall vote 403, to name the Department of Veterans Affairs outpatient clinic located in Peoria, Illinois (H.R. 4608); rollcall vote 404, conference report for Coast Guard Reauthorization (H.R. 2443); rollcall vote 405, Tax Simplification for America's Job Creation Act (H.R. 4840); and rollcall vote 406, Military Housing Improvement Act (H.R. 4879).

Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" for rollcall votes 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, and 406.

INTRODUCTION OF HIS PRIVATE BILL FOR THE RELIEF OF JUDITH TANJOH AND HER CHILDREN SERGE, MARIE, EMMANUEL AND ROGER TIKUM

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 22, 2004

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill for the relief of Judith Tanjoh and her children Serge, Marie, Emmanuel and Roger Tikum.

This family last entered the United States in 1988 in A-2 diplomatic status from the Republic of Cameroon when the now deceased husband of Judith Tanjoh was attached to the Cameroon Embassy. For the next several years the family lived in lawful status in the U.S. through December 31, 1997 when the husband was recalled to the Cameroon because of Judith's political activities against the Cameroon government.

Cameroon has been found by the U.S. State Department's Country Reports on Human Rights Practices to possess a "poor human rights record", continuing to commit "numerous serious abuses". After her husband's recall, Judith decided to file for asylum. However, in turn her application was denied by the INS Asylum Office, the Immigration Judge, the Board of Immigration Appeals, and the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 4th Circuit.

When the Board of Immigration Appeals "affirmed without opinion" the denial of the asylum application by the Immigration Judge on December 17, 2002, it also permitted the family to "voluntarily depart the U.S. . . . within 30 days from the date of this order or any extension beyond that time as may be granted by the district director [of the INS]". Within that 30 day period, Judith's attorneys filed for an extension of the voluntary departure period and a Petition for Review in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 4th Circuit. Each filing was in accordance with the family's statutory and regulatory rights.

The INS has never responded to the request for extension of the voluntary departure period. The 4th Circuit issued its mandate on November 10, 2003 "enforcing the Board's order of December 17, 2002". Of course, part of that order was permitting the family to voluntarily depart within 30 days.

While these proceedings were pending, INS issued Judith authorization to work and she obtained employment as a certified nursing assistant. Her employer has sponsored her (and her children derivatively) for lawful permanent residence via the Labor Certification process. That application, initially filed prior to April 30, 2001, has been certified by the U.S. Department of Labor and an Immigrant Worker's Visa Classification Petition has been pending with INS since July, 2003.

An INS General Counsel's Memo advises INS Government Attorneys to no longer apply the "exceptional and compelling circumstances" standard to motions to reopen for consideration of adjustment of status to lawful permanent residence for persons who have been in deportation proceedings. The Memo instructs that the INS should join in such a motion (which otherwise could not be filed if more than 3 months have expired since the decision of the Board of Immigration Ap-

peals) if the alien is statutorily eligible and warrants a favorable exercise of discretion. Judith's attorneys have twice requested the INS Chief Counsel's Office in Baltimore to join in such a motion in this case. Since Judith's labor certification was timely filed to allow her to adjust her status to permanent residence, she is statutorily eligible.

The family also clearly warrants a favorable exercise of discretion. Judith has been a hard-working, tax-paying certified nursing assistant for several years as she has worked with INS permission. The children have successfully progressed through our school system for the last 15 years. Roger Tikum graduated college and is now married, employed and living in Wisconsin. Although his wife is a U.S. citizen who has filed a Visa Petition to accord him Immediate Relative status, because he was previously riding on his mother's denied asylum application he faces deportation. Serge won a football scholarship to the University of Massachusetts at Amherst where he is a starting linebacker and an excellent student. Marie is doing well at Montgomery Community College. Emmanuel is a star football player at Bethesda-Chevy Chase High School, where he has also made honor roll.

The Tanjoh/Tikum family are not criminals. They are not terrorists. The children fear being uprooted from their true home in the U.S. and forced to live in a human rights abusive country which they do not know and whose predominant language they do not speak.

Yet, the INS Government Attorneys have coldly rejected each overture for clemency. First, by insisting that the harsher "exceptional and compelling circumstances" standard applies and that these circumstances were neither exceptional nor compelling. Second, by stating that the family was not statutorily eligible for permanent residence because they overstayed the Board of Immigration Appeals' December 17, 2002 Order granting a 30 day voluntary departure period even though the INS has never responded to the extension requests and even though the family timely pursued their Petition for Review rights to the 4th Circuit which only enforced the Board's Order on November 10, 2003.

Therefore, today I have introduced a Private Bill that will enable Judith Tanjoh and the Tikum children to obtain permanent residency. I hope my action today will help bring this heartbreaking story to a close.

TRIBUTE TO ALEWEL'S COUNTRY MEATS

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 22, 2004

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, let me take this opportunity to honor Alewel's Country Meats for their contribution in shipping more than 1,000 pounds of beef jerky to provide our Missouri National Guardsmen serving in Iraq a taste of home.

Alewel's Country Meats was started in the year 1932 by Hugo and Emil Alewel of Concordia, Missouri. Originally called Alewel Brothers, the name was later changed to Alewel's Country Meats in 1964. The plant grew to enormous size and in 1974 they expanded to Warrensburg, Missouri. My good

friend, Roger Alewel, once ran Alewel's Country Meats, and his able son, Randy, now runs the company.

Alewel's Country Meats is known for their prize winning country hams, bacon, and sausage which are produced from the freshest meat of mid-Missouri. With a legacy of over 70 years, Alewel's Country Meats has become known not only for their quality meats but also for their charitable donations to rural Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, the generous contribution by Alewel's Country Meats is inspirational to all of us. I know the Members of the House will join me in paying tribute to the outstanding commitment to our service members shown by the men and women who work there.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROBIN HAYES

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 22, 2004

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I was detained on Thursday, July 15 and Monday, July 19, 2004. Had I been present I would have voted in the following manner: "Yea" on roll No. 385, "nay" on roll No. 386, "yea" on roll No. 387, "nay" on roll No. 388, "nay" on roll No. 389, "nay" on roll No. 390, "yea" on roll No. 391, "yea" on roll No. 392, and "yea" on roll No. 393.

HONORING THE 32ND MILITARY POLICY COMPANY

HON. MARK GREEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 22, 2004

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to recognize before this House the courageous soldiers of the 32nd Military Police Company, who tomorrow will return home to Wisconsin after spending 16 months fighting for peace and stability in Iraq.

In the face of constant danger, the members of the 32nd helped pave the way for Iraq's steady march toward democracy. Throughout their tour, these brave men and women provided vital security in and around Baghdad, and helped train the new civilian Iraqi police force. Their tireless efforts proved instrumental in helping the new Iraqi government take control of their fledgling democracy, and their sacrifice reminds us all that freedom is not free.

Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct honor to pay tribute to the 32nd Military Police Company. With 23 Purple Hearts awarded, their unit suffered more injuries from hostile action than any Wisconsin National Guard unit since World War II. On behalf of the citizens of Wisconsin's Eighth Congressional District, and a grateful nation, it is my honor to recognize and welcome home these great Americans.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LUIS V. GUTIERREZ

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 22, 2004

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, on July 9, 2004, I inadvertently missed rollcall vote 357.